IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WP NO. 1530 /2003

PETITIONER

Murlidhar Sahu, aged about 19 years, son of Late Shri Chaleshwar Gajpal, resident of village Matrodih, PO Khupali, Police Station Utai, Distt. Durg (Chhattisgarh).

VERSUS

RESPONDENT

1) Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, through : Its Secretary, Danganiyan, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

P.R. No. 1355/03 Presented by Shri Mahesh Pandey dated 05.05.03

2) Executive Engineer, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, 400 K.V. Sub Station, Khedamara, Bhilai, Distt. Durg (C.G.).

3) Chairman, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board, Danganiyan, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF AN APPROPRIATE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS / CERTIORARI ETC. OR DIRECTION / ORDER IN THE LIKE NATURE ETC.

To

XI-HC-22

(32)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 1530 [illegible] 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

26-3-2004

Shri R. M. Pandey, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Bhaskar Pyasi, Panel Lawyer for respondent No.3.

Heard both the counsel.

The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India whereby the petitioner has prayed for directing the respondents to consider and appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground.

The petitioner's case is that his father was appointed in Madhya Pradesh State Electricity Board as Security Guard on 15-12-79 and his father while serving under respondents had expired on 30-10-99. On 17-4-2000, the petitioner had submitted an application for appointment on compassionate ground to the Executive Engineer, Division Sub Centre, Bhilai, which was forwarded to Chief Engineer, M.P.E.B., Raipur. The application of the petitioner was returned by the Chief Engineer, Raipur on 7-7-2000 with a note to apply in prescribed proforma. The petitioner again submitted an application in a prescribed proforma to respondent No.1 on 9-12-2002.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondents have issued appointment orders to many persons on compassionate ground. Counsel further submitted that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondents 1 & 2 and respondents 1 & 2 may be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner to which the learned counsel for respondent No.3 has no objection.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(33)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर-सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

allowed to make a detailed representation raising all his grievances to respondents 1&2 within a period of 10 days from today and in turn, respondents 1&2 will decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the representation considering all the grievances of the petitioner and will pass a reasoned order.

In view of this order, I.A. No.9593/2003 stands disposed of.

With the aforesaid directions, this writ petition is disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C.BHADOO
Judge

Barve

[पीछे देखिये